

A LETTER

To the Honourable

Robert Boyle, Esq.

DEFENDING

The **DIVINE AUTHORITY**

OF THE

HOLY SCRIPTURE,

And that it alone is the **RULE** of **FAITH.**

IN ANSWER TO

Father Simon's Critical History

OF THE

Old Testament.

Written by **C. M. Du Veil, D D.**

*Sufficit Christiano ad confutandum errorem quolibet dicere,
Scriptura non habet. Lutherus.*

*The Fathers in their Homilies did use constantly to declare to the
People, what they were to believe, and what they were to practise
out of the Scripture. Dean Tillotson's Rule of Faith, P. 1. Sect. 3.*

LONDON: Printed for **Thomas Maltby** at the **Sun** in
the **Poultry,** 1683.

A LETTER

FROM THE

THE DIVINE AUTHORITY

HOLY SCRIPTURE

AND THE APOSTOLICAL TEACHING

IN ANSWER TO

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE



A LETTER

To the Honourable

Robert Boyle, Esq.

*To prove that the Scripture alone is the
Rule of Faith, &c.*

Honourable Sir,

A Book indeed full of Learning, Printed at Paris without a Title-Sheet, came lately to my hands, intituled, *The Critical History of the Old Testament*; Whereof Father Simon, Priest of the Oratory of Paris is thought to be the Author. He pretends to prove in that Work, that nothing for certain can be asserted in Religion, unless Tradition be joyned with the Scripture for the Decision of Questions of Faith. *There is without doubt Ignorance*, says that Author in his Preface, or *Prepossession in the Minds* of the Protestants, *Who pretend that the Scripture is clear of it self*. Nevertheless Sir, nothing is more certain in all that can be called *Tradition*, than this Principle

of the Protestants. St. *Chrysostom* in his third Homily of *Lazarus*, observes after *Origen* this difference between the Philosophers and the Authors of the Scripture, that the Philosophers are obscure, whereas the Apostles and Prophets being the common Masters of the Universe, have written after so clear a manner, that every Capacity may be instructed in their Doctrine by the reading alone thereof. And in the same Homily that Doctor maintains that the ignorance of the Sacred Scriptures is the source of the Corrupted Morals, as well as of all the Heresies. St. *Augustin* in the second Book of the *Christian Doctrine* says, Chap. 9. *In iis qua aperte in Scriptura posita sunt, inventiuntur illa omnia qua Continent fidem moresque vivendi: In those things which are plainly laid down in Scripture, are found all those things which pertain to Faith, and the Rules of Living.* This the Learned *Gerson*, Chancellor of the University of *Paris*, expresses in these terms: *Sensus Literalis Scripturae satis expressus est in iis qua sunt necessaria ad Salutem.* And this induced the Church of *England* to make this Canon with great reason, in the Synod of *London* in 1552, and 1562.

The Scripture containeth all things necessary to Salvation: So that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, although it be some time received of the faithful as godly and profitable for an Order and Comeliness, yet no man ought to be constrained to believe it as an Article of Faith, or reputed requisite to the Necessity of Salvation.

Father *Simon* does disingenuously quote the thought of St. *Augustin* in the 7th. Chap. of the third book of his *Critical History*. That Holy Doctor supposes, says he, that the Scripture is obscure and hard to be understood, and yet he adds

adds that for the most part what is obscure in one place is found laid plainly open in another, and that what regards the belief and manners is much more clearly expressed in the Bible than all the rest. Now to read the thought of St. *Augustine* in the Book of Father *Simon*, that Doctor seems only to assert that commonly the Scripture is clear in what concerns the belief and manners, nay and more clear than in all the rest. But St. *Augustine* says more in the Words Cited: for he says absolutely that all we ought to believe and do, is found clearly in the Scripture, & therefore according to Father *Simon*, There is without doubt either Ignorance or Prepossession of Mind in St. *Augustine*, as well as in St. *Chrysostom*, *Gerson*, & generally in all the Great Divines of Antiquity, who have been perswaded with **Origen*, that not any Sentiment is worthy of Faith, unless it be proved by Scripture; nor any interpretation of the same Scripture to be admitted, without it be confirmed and supported upon Passages of the Old or New Testament: for this Reason is it that in the Decree of *Gratian*, Distinct. 27. in the Chap. which begins with this word *Relatum*, there is an express order to decide all Controversies by the Holy Writ, and to explain the obscure passages which are met with therein by the Scriptures themselves: *ex ipsis Scripturis*. But this is sufficient Entertaining you Sir, with the groundless Sentiment of Father *Simon*, touching the insufficiency of the Scripture, for the instructing People in Religion. Now I proceed to the three proofs which he makes use of for the Establishing of his Opinion.

* Tom. 1. in
Jerem.

The first is taken from the great Changes which have happen'd as well in the Original Text as in the Versions of the Scripture. This proof may seem to have some force upon an *Atheist* or a *Pagan*; but not upon a *Chri-*

7
stian, Who knows, that notwithstanding the Changes that have been made in Scripture, *Jesus Christ*, The Apostles, and the Fathers of the Church, have always proved the Truth of their Doctrine by the Scripture. As for what concerns the Fathers, I shall show it amply in my answer to the third proof of Father *Simon*, though what I have already urged might suffice. In regard of *Jesus Christ* and his Apostles, Father *Simon* says, *That they have sited the Testimonys which they Cited out of the Old Testament, to the Explications received and authorized by Tradition.* But this is a false fore-judging of that Father, of whom with reason these Words of St. *Jerome* may be said, *Hoc de Scripturis Authoritatem non habet, ideo ea facilitate Contemnitur qua probatur; This has no Authority from Scriptures, therefore may be rejected with the same ease it is admitted.* *Jesus* reprehends Traditions, and yet father *Simon* would make us believe that he establishes his Doctrine by Tradition, and that he only makes use of the Word of God, according to the Pre-judgment of Tradition. It was a Tradition amongst the *Jews*, founded upon a passage of the Prophet *Malachy* misunderstood, that *Elias* was to precede by his Preaching the coming of the *Messias*; but the Gospel tells us, that tradition did ill interpret the Prophet *Malachy*, who did not pretend to speak of the Person of the Prophet *Elias*, but of *John the Baptist*, who was to forego *Jesus Christ*, in Spiritu & Virtute *Elia*. It is evident by the 5th. Chapter, of St. *Matth.* that the *Jews* explaining the Scriptures by the Pre-judgment of Tradition, had very faulty Morals: But *Jesus Christ* who came not to destroy the Law and the Prophets, but to fulfil them, rejects the false Expositions given to the Law by the *Jews* according to their Traditions, and discovers the real sense thereof conformably to other passages.

sages of the Old Testament, which contain in clear terms the same things, which *Jesus Christ* ordered his Disciples to do for the surpassing the justice of the Scribes, and *Pharisees*, that they might enter into the Kingdom of Heaven. The Pre-judgments of Tradition made the Disciples of *Jesus Christ* still doubt after his Resurrection, if it was he who should redeem *Israel*; but *Jesus Christ* to free them out of that pernicious doubt, reproaches them with their hardness of heart, and slowness to believe all that the Prophets have said. And to disengage them entirely from that false Tradition which ran amongst the People, as *Theophylact* does remark in his Commentary upon the 24 Chap. of St. *Luke*, beginning with *Moses*, and continuing through all the Prophets, he explains to them all that had been said of him in all the Scriptures, as St. *Luke* does relate it in the last Chapter of his Gospel. *Christ* does never refer People to Traditions for their Instruction in truths necessary to Salvation, but alwayes to the Scripture. If you believed *Moses*, said he to the Jews in St. *John*. Chap. 6. You would believe me also, because it is of me he has written; but if you believe not what he has written, how should you believe what I tell you? St. *Paul* says expressly in his 2 *Tim.* Chap. 3. That the Holy Scriptures are able to make us wise unto Salvation through Faith which is in *Jesus Christ*. And to explain this thought more amply he adds, All Scripture is given by Inspiration of God, and is profitable for Doctrine, for Reproof, for Correction, for Instruction in Righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good Works. This is what the Fathers of the Council of *Frankfort* express in these terms, in the Capitulary of *Charles the Great*, lib. 2. cap. 30. *Est plane Divina Scriptura Verax, est sana, est casta, est Celestis Magisterii Instrumentum, & Eterna*

terna prædicatio purissimo nitens eloquio, est Lux mortalium, dicente Propheta, Lucerna pedibus meis verbum tuum Domine, et Lumen Semitis meis. Est Vivax et mori nesciens, dicente Apostolo, Vivus est Sermo Dei & efficax, & penetrabilior omni gladio ancipiti, & perstringens usque ad divisionem animæ, ac Spirituum. Est renebrarum diffusio, Salomone testante, qui ait, Lucerna est mandatum legis & lux vita, & increpatio, & Disciplina: de quo per Esaiam dicitur, De nocte spiritus meus vigilat ad te Deus, quia lux præcepta tua sunt super terram. The Holy Scripture is plainly true, is stable, is chaste, the Instrument of Celestial Power, and an eternal Preaching shining throughout with a most pure eloquence, is the Light of Mortals, according to the saying of the Prophet, Thy Word, O Lord, is a Lamp to my feet, and a Light unto my pathes; Is quick and immortal, as the Apostle says, The Word of God is quick and Powerful, sharper then a two-edged Sword, and piercing even to the dividing asunder of Soul & Spirit. Is the dissipating & dispelling of thick darkness, witnessa Solomon, who says, The Commandment is a Lamp, and the Law is light, and reproofs of instruction are the way of life: Of whom it is said by Esaias, Every night my Spirit waiteth upon thee O God, because thy Precepts are a light upon the earth. And as the Holy Writ possesseth these advantages, not by reason of the words, but by reason of the truths which it contains, according to the saying of St. Jerome in Cap. 3 ad Gal. Nec putemus in verbis Scripturarum esse Evangelium, sed in sensu, non in superficie, sed in medulla, non in sermonum foliis, sed in radice rationis: Jesus Christ and his Apostles had reason in their Citations to apply themselves more to the real sence then to the meer words of the Holy VVrit. Moreover to instruct us, That all that has passed under the Law of Nature and of Moses was the figure and shadow of what

what was to pass under the Gospel, *Jesus Christ* and his Apostles give us very often the allegorical sense of the passages which they Cite but of the Old Testament.

The second reason of Father *Simon*, which he calls a *very evident proof*, to show that the Scripture is not sufficient to decide Controversies in matter of Religion, is taken from that the *Socinians* do agree with the *Protestants*, that the only and true Principle of Religion is the Holy Writ, and that nevertheless they draw from thence very different Conclusions. If Father *Simon* said, the *Socinians* and *Protestants* differ in the Conclusions, which they draw from the Scriptures, therefore one or other of'em is in the error, because they do not understand the Scriptures aright, the argumentation would be pure; But I do not see by what *Logic* he draws this inference that the Scripture is not sufficient to decide Controversies; *Since it is manifest that the Socinians govern themselves by prejudgments in the explication of the Scripture, as Father Simon speaks in his Critical History of the Old Testament, Book 3 chap. 16.* Therefore if the *Socinians* draw quite contrary Conclusions to what the *Protestants* do from the same Scriptures, it is not the obscurity of the Scripture that is the cause thereof, but the prejudgments of the *Socinians*, which make 'em abuse the Scripture to favour the Systeme of Religion which they have invented independantly of Scripture. The Devil abuses the Scripture to Tempt *Jesus Christ*, and *Jesus Christ* resists him by using the Scripture aright, *Falsas de Scripturis Diaboli sagittas veris Scripturarum frangit Clypeis*, says *St. Jerome*: And this the *Protestants* do every day in their Controversy with the *Socinians*; and this is what ought generally to be done in all Controversies upon matters of Religion; and if the Fathers of the first Ages be Cited in these Disputes, it ought
only

only to make people sensible that those persons who studied the Scriptures to learn therein what it is God would have us believe and do to be saved, did draw the same Doctrine from thence, which we do who are also *Orthodox*, when they had no vail nor blind before their eyes, which hindred them from seeing the day and the light of the Word of God in the Scriptures, that is to say, when they had no Systeme of Religion independant of Scriptures. The *Pharisees* falsely concluded from that the Scripture says, *That a man may leave his Wife by giving her a Writing, by which he declares that he puts her away*, that a man was allowed to put away his Wife for any cause soever; but *Jesus Christ* convinces them of an error, not by tradition, but by the Scripture, as we read in the 19. chap. of *St. Mathew*. The *Saducees* who rejected all traditions, pretended to conclude from the Scripture that there would be no Resurrection of the Dead, and *Jesus Christ* did not tell them that they fell into that error because they did not joyn tradition to the Scripture, or because they rejected all tradition, but he refutes them by a conclusion drawn out of Scriptures, & tells them, *You are in an error because you do not understand the Scriptures; Erratis nescientes Scripturas*. And indeed *St. Augustine* very judiciously remarks, That the *Hereticks* are only so by their obstinately persevering to give a false sence to the Scriptures which they do not understand, *Omnes Haretici Scripturas Catholicas legunt nec ob aliud sunt Haretici nisi quod eas non recte intelligentes, suas falsas Opiniones contra earum veritatem perveraciter asserunt*. The same Holy Doctor in his 18th. Treatise upon the Gospel of *St. John*: says, *Non nata sunt Hareses & quadam Dogmata perversitatis illaqueantia animos, & in profundum precipitantia, nisi cum Scriptura bona intelliguntur non bene, & quod in eis*

vis non bene intelligitur, etiam temere & audacter assertitur. Heresy and certain perverse Tenets ensnaring peoples minds, and plunging them into the abyss, have onely proceeded from a misunderstanding of the Scriptures, and when what is not well understood in them, is nevertheless rashly and audaciously asserted. Chromatius who St. Jerome calls the most holy, most learned Bishop of his time, tells us upon the 5 verse of the 5. chap. of St. Mat. That the Scripture is clear, but that the Jews and Hereticks endeavour to hide from us its perspicuity by their perverse interpretations; *Perspicuam lucem predicationis divinae pravis interpretationibus obtegere & occultare nituntur, proinde perfidiam predicando & lumen veritatis erroris tenebris obvelando.* From all this it may be concluded, that when people dispute against the Socinians and other Hereticks, to convert them, the method of Jesus Christ must be followed, and they must be Convicted of error by the Scripture it self. All that is not formally read in Scripture, or is not drawn from thence by an evident Conclusion, is subject to error, and by consequence cannot be the Rule of our belief. The very Disciples of Jesus Christ were mistaken in the rumour which ran amongst them that St. John did not dye, because that rumour was onely grounded upon a conclusion falsely inferred from what Jesus Christ had said to St. Peter speaking of St. John? *If I will that he stay until I come, what's that to thee.* Nay the Scripture seems to show us this on purpose that we might learn, that what in matter of Religion is not well grounded upon its authority, is not worthy of faith: *Sine autoritate Scripturarum garrulitas non habet fidem.* saith St. Jerome. All the Fathers of the first Ages teach us this truth in all the disputes they had with the Hereticks of their time. For, as Jansenius that learned Prelate of Ipre does observe in his Book In-

Torn. 2 lib,
Proem. C. 5.

intituled *Augustinus*, they so formed their sentiments by the Holy Scriptures, that they almost expressed themselves in the same form: *In antiquis patribus* saith he, *eorumque disputationibus duo sunt consideranda magnopere; primum quod ex principii verbi Dei sensus suos, & sero verba promerent; secundum quod religiose intra terminos oppugnata ab errore veritatis sine ulla superfluarum multominus curiosarum, frivolarum, atque inutilium quaestionum intermixtione remanerent.* In the ancient Fathers and their disputes two things are principally to be considered. First that they draw their sense and tenets, nay and almost their very terms out of the Principles of the Word of God.

Secondly, that they religiously remain within the bounds of the Truth that was combated by Error without any intermixture of superfluous, needless of curious, frivolous and impertinent questions. Thus as Scripture is the onely way to decide questions of Religion, *panormitanus* had reason to say that people ought rather to believe a Lay-man who authorizes himself by Scripture, then a Pope and a whole Council, when they act without its authority. *Magis credendum laico si scripturas adferat, quam Papa & toti Concilio si absque scripturis agant.* St. Epiphanius who has given a Catalogue of all the Heresies which had been until his time, and remarks the abuse which the Authors of those Heresies have made of the Holy Writ to establish their Errours, does not attribute this to the obscurity of the Scripture, but to the Hereticks not having applyed themselves to Scripture with a Spirit of Piety; for it is a constant Principle, says that Saint, that all the saving Truths are found clearly in the Scripture by those who read them with judgment and a spirit with piety. *πάντα σαφὲς ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ τοῖς θεοφιλεῖς ἐκείνοις. ἀποστολῇ περὶ ἐκείνου τῷ δὲ ἀγῶνι* St. Augustine
dis.

disputing against Maximin, an Arian Bishop, lays down for Principle that the Authority alone of Scripture is to be insisted upon: *Non ego Nicanum Concilium tibi, nec tu mihi Ariminense tamquam prajudicaturus proferas: nec ego hujus auctoritate, nec tu illius desimeris. Scripturarum auctoritatibus non quorumlibet propriis, sed utrisque communibus testibus, res cum re, ratio cum ratione decertet.* I do not urge to thee the Nicene Council! nor do thou to me that of Ariminum as a forejudging of the Controversie: Neither do I mean the authority of the one, neither art thou bound by that of the other. But let matter of fact & the reason of each Council be tryed by authority of the Scriptures, which both are bound to admit as witnessing the Divine Truths. He says in the same place, that the Council of Nice insisted only upon Scriptures. And indeed it would be impertinent to place the Bible in the midst of the Councils, unless it were to put them in mind, that their Decisions would not be worthy of faith, unless they were founded upon the authority of the Scripture. Which has been admirably well said by Optat Bishop of Mileve in his Book against Parmenian; *Quarendi sunt iudices—in terra de hac re nullum poterit reperiri iudicium, de Cælo quarendus est iudex. Sed ut quid pulsamus ad Cælum, cum habeamus hic in Evangelio Testamentum? Terrenus Pater cum se in Confinio censerit mortis, timens ne post mortem suam rupta pace litigent fratres, adhibitis testibus voluntatem suam de pectore morituro transfert in tabulas diu duraturas. Es si fuerit inter fratres contentio nata, non itur ad tumultum sed quaritur Testamentum.* Judges must be sought in the case—No judgment can be had in this matter upon earth, a Judge is to be sought for from Heaven. But why should we have recourse to Heaven, seeing we have here its will in the Gospel? An Earthly Father when he sees himself upon the brink of Death, fearing, least after his

death, the peace coming to be broken, the Brethren should be at variance, having called the witnesses transmitteth his Will from his dying breath into Deeds of long continuance. And if any contention shall arise amongst the Brethren, let them not go to the Tomb, but seek out the Testament. In short, even as the Gospel does assure us, that those who having Moses and the Prophets do not live conformably to their Doctrine, would not be Converted by the exhortations of the Dead though they should return, so those who are not instructed and perswaded of the saving truths by the Holy Scripture, will never be perswaded by tradition. Father Simon cannot dispute this in the least, since he says himself in the 10. Chap. of the 1. Book of his Critical Hist. *That it often happens that men being the Keepers of Tradition, do blend therein what they have invented, and then it is a hard matter to distinguish the true Traditions from those which are false.*

The third proof which I find in the Critical Hist. of Father Simon to show the insufficiency of the Scripture to decide Controversies in matter of Religion, is *That there has been in all times in the Churches an abridgment of Religion independantly of Scripture.* Nay he pretends that it is upon the account of that abridgment, that the Fathers have explained the Scriptures, and that the Councils have decided the Controversies of their time. I do not doubt but that in all ages there have Catechisms been made for the instruction of Children and the shallowest Capacities; or abridgments of Religion; But I deny that those abridgments were made independantly of Scripture. I maintain against Father Simon that those who govern'd the Church took care to collect into an abridgment the clearest sentences of Scripture, and the most necessary to instruct the faithful in the saving Truths, and the Fathers and Councils had reason afterwards

wards to decide the Controversies according to those abridgments, since their taking that Course was to explain obscure passages by those which are clearer, as good sense doth require. All the passages which I have already Cited, do manifestly prove what I urge; nay and if we may believe those Authors who have treated of Ecclesiastical Offices, the lessons of the Scripture, which the Church of *Rome* still reads at this day on *Easter* and *Whitsun-eve*, are onely the Catechisms and instructions which were given to the *Catechumenes*, or Novice Profelytes who were baptized on those days. The most ancient abridgment of Religion which we have left of antiquity is the Symbol which is said to have been composed by the Apostles; But this Abridgment is not independant of the Scripture; as St. *Aug.* says, book the first of the Symbol to the *Catechumenes* Chap. 1. *Ista verba qua audistis, per divinas Scripturas sparsa sunt, sed inde collecta, & ad unum redacta ne tardorum hominum memoria laboraret, ut omnis homo possit dicere, possit tenere quod credit.* Those words you have heard are scattered thro the Holy Scriptures, but Collected from thence, and reduced in a Body that they might not be burdensome to the Memories of shallow Capacities; and that every man might say and remember what he believes. And *Rabanus Maurus* speaking of the same Symbole in the 56th Chapter of his second Book de *Institutione Clericorum*, says, *In quo quidem pauca sunt Verba, sed omnia continentur Sacramenta, de totis enim Scripturis hac breviter Collecta sunt ab Apostolis, ut quoniam plures Credentium Litteras nesciunt, vel qui sciunt, pra-occupatione seculi legere non possunt, hac corde retinentes, habeant sufficientem sibi scientiam salutarem.* In which indeed are contained but few Words, but all the Mysteries being thus briefly collected from all the Scriptures, by the Apostles, that several of the Believers who know not how to

read, or those who do, being hindered from reading by the business of the world, getting these by hears, might have a Knowledge sufficient to work out their Salvation. The Church of England speaking of this Abridgment, as well as of those which are called the Symboles of Nice and of St. Athanasius, says in the Synods of London in 1552. 1562. **The three Creeds, Nicene Creed, Athanasius's Creed, & that which is commonly cal'd Apostles Creed, ought thro'ly to be receibed: for they may be probe'd by most certain warrants of Holy Scripture.** St. Cyprian did certainly never own any Abridgement of Religion independently of Scripture, since in his Epistle to Pompeius he demands that they should show him in Scripture that Hereticks were not to be baptized again, to perswade him that it is an Apostolical Tradition. *Si aut in Evangelio Praecipitur, aut in Apostolorum epistolis, aut Actibus continetur, ut a quacumque haeresi venientes non baptizentur, sed tantum manus illis imponantur in Penitentiam, observetur divina hac & sancta Traditio.* If there can be shown any Precept of the Gospel, or in the Epistles, or Acts of the Apostles, that those who are converted from what Heresy soever, ought not to be baptized, but only to be reconcil'd to the Church by Repentance, let that Divine and Holy Tradition be observed. This Abridgement was unknown to Tertulian, who says in his dispute against Hermogenes, Chap. 22. *Adoro Scriptura plenitudinem. — Scriptum esse doceat Hermogenis officina, si non est Scriptum, timeat illud. Va adjicientibus aut detrahentibus destinatum.* "I adore the fulness of Scripture; let Hermogenes demonstrate that it is Written; If it be not writen, let him fear that Woe which is pronounced against those who add or lessen it. The same in his Book of the Flesh of Christ Chap. 7. disputing against Apelles, he has not recourse

to the Pretended Abridgements of Father Simon, but he tells that Heresiarque, *Non Recipio quod extra Scripturam de tuo inferis*; I do not allow of what thou urgest that is not in Scripture. This Abridgement was unknown to St. Augustin, who in his Book of the Unity of the Church against the Epistle of Petilian, Chap. 11. says, *Quis quis aliud Evangelizaverit, Anathema sit, Whosoever preaches ought else for Gospel, let him be accursed, and Chap. 12. Aut legat mihi hoc in Scripturis, & non sit Anathema*; Or let him produce me this in Scriptures, and he shall not be accursed. And in the same Chapter, *Si autem non ea de sacris Scripturis legunt, sed suis contentionibus persuadere conantur, Credo illa quae in Scripturis sanctis leguntur, non Credo ista quae ab Hereticis vanis dicuntur*. But if they do not read those things in the Holy Scriptures, but endeavour to persuade by their Wranglings, I believe those things which are read in Scriptures, I do not believe those which are asserted by vain Hereticks. The same Doctor in the 2d. Book de Nupt. & Concup. Chap. 33. says, *Ista Controversia judicem querit, judicet ergo Christus, & cui rei mors ejus profuerit, ipse dicat* — judicet cum illo & Apostolus, quia in Apostolo ipse loquitur Christus. This Controversy requires a Judge, therefore let Christ judge, and say of what Advantage his Death hath been, and let the Apostle judge with him, because Christ himself speaks in the Apostle. In his Book of Grace, and free will Chap. 13. *Sedeat inter nos iudex Apostolus Joannes, Let the Apostle John judge between us*. And in the 2d. Book against Cresconius, Chap. 32. *Litteras Cypriani non ut Canonicas habeo, sed eas ex Canonicis considero, & quod in eis divinarum Scripturarum auctoritati congruit, cum laude ejus accipio; quod autem non congruit, cum pace ejus respuo*. I do not allow of the Letters of Cyprian as Canonical, but I judge of them by the canonical Scriptures, and what in them is congruous to the

the Authority of the Holy Scriptures, I receive with due praise to him; but what is incongruous, I Reject with his leave. In short, this Abridgement was unknown to the Councils, seeing they placed the Scriptures in the midst of them, to serve for a Rule to their Decisions, which would have been to no purpose if there had been in all times in the Church an Abridgement of Religion independant of the Scriptures. Father *Simons* saying, That the Apostles preached the Gospel before they wrote it, and that in the time of St. *Irenæus*, there were still several Churches who believed in the Gospel by Tradition, without having seen it in Writing, serves little to Authorize his pretended Abridgement, for certain it is that when we say, that the Scriptures contain clearly all that is necessary to Salvation, we do not oppose the Truths couched upon Paper in the Scripture, against the same truths uttered by the tongue of the Preachers; we know that the Prophets and Apostles ought to have been believed when they preached the Truths which the Holy Ghost inspired into them, as well as when they reduced 'em into Writing; But we only say that the Apostles and Prophets have reduced the same truths which they Preached into Writing after such a manner, that for the Regulating of our Faith we only need to have recourse to their Writing. This is what St. *Irenæus* says, in his third Book against Heresies, Chap. 1. *Non enim per alios dispositionem salutis nostra cognovimus, quam per eos, per quos evangelium pervenit ad nos, quod quidem tunc praconiaverunt; postea vero per Dei voluntatem in Scripturis nobis tradiderunt, fundamentum & columnam fidei nostra futurum.* We know not by others the Disposition of our Salvation, than

by

by those from whom the Gospel came to us, which indeed, they then Preached: But afterwards by the will of God they delivered to us in Scriptures, to be the Foundation and Pillar of our Faith. If Father Simon asks us what assurance we can have that the saving truths were not altered in the Holy Writ, we can answer him that the Tradition or Preaching of the Gospel in all Ages, was the instrument which God made use of, to make known to us that the Scripture is the Word of God, and that it was never altered after such a manner, but that it still contains very clearly what we ought to believe, and what we ought to do to be saved. But that it is God who hath perswaded us inwardly of the Truth of this Preaching; and this answer is very true, since that the Faith is a gift from God, and very conformable to what St. Augustine saies, speaking to God in the 5. chap. of his 6th. Book of his Confessions. *Persuasisti mihi, non qui crederent libris tuis, sed qui non crederent, esse culpandos: Nec audiendos esse si qui forte dicent, Unde scis illos unius veri & veracissimi Dei Spiritu esse humano generi ministratos.* "Thou hast perswaded me, that those "who do not believe in thy Books, not those who do believe, are guilty; nor are they to be given Ear to, if "they should by chance say, Whence knowest thou that "they were administred to Humane Kind in the Spirit of the most true and upright God. I have nothing more Sir, then to make an end with beseeching you to thank God for me, that he has given me by his mercy that precious gift of the faith, and perswaded me to renounce the Idolatry, *Heterodox* Traditions, & Superstitious Novelties of the Church of Rome, & to embrace an *orthodox* Communion, which professes to love the Brotherhood, fear God, and honour the King, and to Rule her Morals as well as her worship and Faith onely by the Scripture.

Fides ex auditu Rom. 10. 17.

Scripture divinely inspired, *non taliter fecit omni Nationi*, and to desire the same God to continue to me his Grace, and Protection, whom I heartily pray that he would more and more shed abroad his Blessings over your worthy Person, and over the Lady *Katherine Viscountess Ranelagh*, Your most Accomplished, Godly, Charitable and Bountiful Sister, and over all your Noble Family.

I am

Sir,

Your Honours

most Humble and most

Obedient Servant,

C. M. Du Veil.
